

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks OF Fox 140 Advisory Spring 223(3):1180 www.uppengs

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/672,069	09/28/2000	Yukihisa Takeuchi	789_048 NP	7280	
25191	7590 05 15.2003				
BURR & BROWN			EXAMINER		
PO BOX 706 SYRACUSE	8 NY 13261-7068		BUDD, MARK	BUDD, MARK OSBORNE	
			ART UNII	PAPER NUMBER	
·		•	2834		
			DATE MAILED: 05/15/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	09/672,069	TAKEUCHI ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Mark Budd	2834			
The MAILING DATE of this communication apperiod for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perior - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  Status		eply be timely filed  y (30) days will be considered timely  THS from the mailing date of this communication			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20	March 2003 .				
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ T	his action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice unde Disposition of Claims	vance except for formal mat r <i>Ex parte Quayl</i> e, 1935 C.I	tters, prosecution as to the merits is D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>3, 1,6-11 and 68-73</u> is/arc pending	in the application.				
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) <u>14-41</u> is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>3,4,6-13 and 68-73</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requirement.				
Application Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examination	er.				
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.					
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.					
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120					
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig	n priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).			
a) All b) Some * c) None of:					
1. Certified copies of the priority documen					
2. Certified copies of the priority documen					
<ul> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the prical application from the International But See the attached detailed Office action for a list</li> </ul>	ureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).				
14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domest	tic priority under 35 U.S.C. §	§ 119(e) (to a provisional application).			
<ul> <li>a)  The translation of the foreign language pro</li> <li>15)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domes</li> </ul>	ovisional application has be	en received.			
Attachment(s)					
<ol> <li>Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)</li> </ol>	5) Notice of In	ummary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) formal Patent Application (PTO-152)			

Art Unit: 2834

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 10-13 and 68-73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brunnee in view of Ogawa (264) or Ogawa (057).

Brunnee teaches the claimed device but using only a single layer of piezo electric material. However, use of multiple layers of peizo metal to increase output and lower impedance is well known as taught by Ogawa. Note Ogawa also teaches electrode inter connections are made on end faces of the piezo or internally. It has long been held that optimization of a known deice (e.g. thru routine experimentation) is within the skill expected of the routineer. Thus, selection specific dimensions would have been obvious to one of ordinary in the art.

Claims 3, 4 and 6-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brunnee in view of Ogawa as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Scarpa or Keem.

These claims that the piezo/thin film interface is roughened. Each of Kolm and Scarpa teach providing rough interface surfaces to form a stronger joint.

Art Unit: 2834

Thus for at least this reason it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to roughen the piezo/thin plate interface of Brunnee.

Claims 14-31 are allowed.

Budd/ds

05/13/03

M